
Title: Sermon of Questions

Author:

There have been some surprising events since our last gathering in Virtue here to renew us to be better Lightbringers. One of the more surprising was the visit of the Regent Rufus Oryan of our Regency to my office one evening. He wished to discuss the last sermon and the fallacy of my claim that his following the philosophy of Balance precluded the following of the Virtues. His basic contention is that attempting to follow the Path of Light guided solely by the Virtues was a fool's quest after the impossible. He purported that by following Balance one could expect to be able to adjust and accept all the differences and difficulties in life with flexibility and understanding. That allowed inclusion of a vastly wider variety of solutions than would be available within the guidelines of Virtue.

He claimed that one could follow and apply the Balance while leading a life of Virtue. He agreed that Balance demands that Order and Chaos be viewed as necessary equals and that Good and Evil must also be viewed as necessary equals. What Rufus denied that by that measure of Balance

one must also view Virtue and Anti-Virtue as necessary equals and thusly remove the need to fight against those lacking in Virtue. He put forth that I was simply a dreamer with no knowledge of life or reality and the proof of this was in my inflexible insistence on using strict guidelines such as the Virtues.

He claimed that striving for what is most probably unattainable by mortal man to be folly and a wasted life and that through the following of Balance one would be free to have a complete life full of the ability to compromise. My dear Rufus, I do pray that you see the error such compromise in all things. I hope you see how accepting and aiming for a lower standard does not lead to a fuller life but instead robs one of the joy of striving to be more and better by continuing to pick themselves up and strive to a higher ideal time and time again.

Our Regent Rufus Oryan further stated that all the Loyalists of the Regency were of good character as they had each sworn their allegiance to him, the Regent. He further stated that he had never seen or heard of any of the Loyalists ever having committed an act that violated the Virtues at any meeting or other time in his presence. I must admit that these statements did set me back on my heels in total

disbelief. Certainly the man who was our Regent and entrusted to defend the Virtues in place of Lord British had not made such statements.

When I attempted to point out that following the Virtues while under close inspection did not make one Virtuous.

Rather it was what one does when out of view that determines more accurately the degree to which one was Virtuous.

We unfortunately were unable to discuss this further as the Regent took his leave indicating he had to attend to other duties. This left much of our differences remaining as differences and not discussed. Among them is the question of whom and what the Regency and the Regent are duty bound to serve.

Perhaps I am the dreamer, but I believe the Regent is empowered to guide the Regency by serving the Regency.

Further, the Regency is to serve the Virtues and the People and through this service does the Regency draw its legitimacy.

Lastly, the oath sworn by the Loyalists should not be solely to the Regent, but rather to the Regency, the People, and most importantly, the Virtues. This oath should not be authored by each guild defining their qualifications and responsibilities to the Regent, but should be one written for the people and the Virtues requiring all the Loyalists to pledge the same fealty. But there I go again

demanding absolutes
rather than just
accepting that which is
offered. There I go asking
the best of our leaders
rather than accepting
what they tell me is my
dole. Perhaps this makes
me a greedy pig, but I
think not.

Finally, let us talk about
the last meeting of the
Regency. It was a
welcome sight to see the
Regent attending and
leading the meeting of
the Regency. It was
unfortunate that members
of the Order of the
Ebon Skull chose to
challenge protocols at the
meeting. This led to the
same argument as they
had the previous meeting,
namely that only Loyalists
are allowed to sit at the
main Table. One might
think that forcing the
member of the Order of
the Ebon Skull to vacate
a seat at the Loyalist
table would not be fitting
with the theory of
Balance, after all, what
bigger allowance could be
performed to show true
faith in Balance?
Unfortunately this
altercation led to general
melee with numerous
casualties on both sides
ultimately leading to a
retreat of the forces of
the Order of the Ebon
Skull.

The disorder at the
meeting did not stop at
this as a group of
disgruntled peasant and
city folk interrupted the
rest of the meeting
voicing complaints. These
protestations went
unheeded at this meeting
and time will tell if they
will remain not addressed.

Through all of this there was effort to continue the business of the night. They discussed how to avoid yet another confrontation with the Order of the Ebon Skull at meetings. The going idea seems to be withdrawing from the people they serve and holding Regency meetings in private allowing only those having proper business to attend upon approval. Guess that would be the end of my attending Regency meetings, but that remains to be seen.

They also discussed what actions could be taken against the Order of the Ebon Skull. It was suggested that eradicating the Order of the Ebon Skull and their evil should be the preferred action of the Regency and any allies they could claim. At this point a member from Hand of Humanis stated bluntly that even though they are Loyalists to the Regent, the Regency would have to dismiss them from any obligations in this action, as they would choose not to fight with the Regency against the Order of the Ebon Skull. When the time came to vote the one member of Hand of Humanis that sits on the Regency Council, Isk, excused himself and left the meeting.

I am sure there was good reason for his departure but the timing is suspect. The only question I would have is how can one claim to be a Loyalist to the Regent and then decide if and when it is to their

liking to support the Regency? This leads to the belief that perhaps they are not truly Loyalists. One must wonder how many others are Loyalist only up to a point? Then again, if the Regency were fully dedicated to the Virtues and held that all Loyalists also be fully dedicated to the Virtues, then such conditional loyalty would not be a problem.

We need to restore our Regency to once again serve the People and the Virtues, thusly working for the betterment of our society. We need to rally and bring forth what we all know is possible in our government and the Regent who leads them. Let our rallying cry be:

“Return the Regency to Virtue and return Virtue to the Regency.”

“Return the Regency to Virtue and return Virtue to the Regency.”

“Return the Regency to Virtue and return Virtue to the Regency.”